

## **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

### **TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO ADDRESSING COASTAL EROSION IN THE SOUTHERN MONTEREY BAY REGION AND LITTORAL CELL**

**SEPTEMBER 16, 2008**

**ONE ELECTRONIC, ONE REPRODUCIBLE AND 5 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CONSULTANT'S  
PROPOSAL MUST BE RECEIVED BY THE MONTEREY BAY SANCTUARY FOUNDATION NO  
LATER THAN OCTOBER 16, 2008, 4:00 P.M. PACIFIC STANDARD TIME.**

**MONTEREY BAY SANCTUARY FOUNDATION  
REF: COASTAL EROSION PROPOSAL  
299 FOAM STREET, SUITE D  
MONTEREY, CA 93940**

**PLEASE DIRECT QUESTIONS TO:  
[Brad.Damitz@noaa.gov](mailto:Brad.Damitz@noaa.gov)**

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

This Request for Proposals (RFP) to conduct a technical evaluation of alternative approaches to addressing coastal erosion in the Southern Monterey Bay region is funded by the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) and administered through a contract with the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation (MBSF). The MBNMS is a federally protected marine area, administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, offshore of California's central coast along 276 miles of shoreline and encompassing 5,322 square miles of ocean. The need for this study was recognized and pursued by the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup (SMBCEW). The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation (MBSF) is a nonprofit partner of the MBNMS, assisting in the funding and implementation of various programs.

The SMBCEW was established by the MBNMS to address the issues of coastal erosion and armoring and develop a regional planning approach in the Southern Monterey Bay (SMB) region encompassing the shoreline between the Salinas River mouth and Wharf II in Monterey. The workgroup has met periodically over the past several years to identify and assess the range of alternative approaches available for responding to erosion. The scope of work for this RFP involves conducting a technical evaluation of the range of potential alternatives identified by the SMBCEW, building upon the work already completed by the workgroup. The analysis and advice from the selected contractor will ultimately be used by the workgroup to develop specific recommendations for projects to be pursued in the SMB region.

This RFP to conduct a technical evaluation of alternative approaches to addressing coastal erosion in the Southern Monterey Bay region is the second of two individual, yet complementary, components of a larger integrated approach for sediment management and addressing coastal erosion in the SMB region. The need for these studies was recognized and pursued by the California Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW), and by the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup (SMBCEW). The first component is a project to develop a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP) for the Southern Monterey Bay region that would serve as consensus-based policy guidance for participating. The development of a CRSMP is nearly complete in collaboration with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), a California joint powers agency representing the counties of Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz, and the cities within, through a grant from the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW). The background information on erosion rates, coastal processes, and geomorphology included in the CRSMP will provide a basis for evaluating the feasibility of the potential erosion response alternatives identified by the SMBCEW. The CRSMP also analyzes and recommends beach nourishment projects for parts of the SMB shoreline—therefore the scope of this RFP does not include analysis of beach nourishment and other sediment management approaches. Both components will be carried out under the direction of AMBAG and the MBNMS. Work will occur in close collaboration with MBNMS and AMBAG staff and the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup (SMBCEW).

## **II. SCOPE OF WORK**

The consultant will work under the direction and guidance of staff from the MBNMS and AMBAG's Coastal Regional Sediment Project Manager. This oversight team will assist the consultant in coordinating work with the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup, the CRSMP process and the public. The selected consultant or consultant team will be expected to describe all proposed work necessary to complete the scope as shown, or propose, justify and describe an alternative work scope. The technical proposal shall include a detailed task specific budget as described herein.

### **A. Background**

The MBNMS was established in 1992 for the purpose of natural and cultural resource protection, research, monitoring, public education, and ensuring balanced, sustainable uses. The MBNMS has been addressing the issues of coastal erosion and armoring in the context of updating the Sanctuary's Management Plan, as well as in reviewing and authorizing permit applications that involve disturbance of the seabed. As part of the draft management plan, the MBNMS has developed an action plan addressing coastal erosion and armoring issues. The goal of this action plan is to reduce expansion of hard coastal armoring in the coastal areas near the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) through proactive regional planning, project tracking, and comprehensive permit analysis and compliance. This action plan recommends developing a more proactive and comprehensive regional approach that minimizes the negative impacts of coastal armoring on a Sanctuary-wide basis.

The Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup was initiated in 2005 by the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, in collaboration with state and local partners, to facilitate the development of a regional approach to coastal erosion. The 20-member workgroup is made up of scientists, federal and state agencies, local governmental representatives, conservation interests and other local experts. The goals of the SMBCEW are to: compile and analyze existing information on erosion rates and geomorphology in the region, as well as identify corresponding critical erosion areas, including threats to private and public structures within the Southern Monterey Bay (SMB) region; identify and assess the complete range of options available for responding to erosion in the region; and, based upon the above analyses, to develop a proactive and comprehensive regional shoreline preservation, restoration, and management plan with selected site-specific and broader area-wide recommendations for responding to coastal erosion that minimize environmental and socioeconomic impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

To date, the SMBCEW has:

- Compiled and analyzed existing information on erosion rates and geomorphology of the region and developed a background report;
- Developed a complete list of critical erosion areas in the SMB region, compiled information about the background of each site, and prioritized these areas based upon level of threat;

- Identified a wide range of options available for responding to erosion and narrowed this initial list, based upon technical feasibility and environmental and socioeconomic considerations, to a smaller more manageable list of 25 options that warrant further analysis and consideration. The workgroup also conducted an initial prioritization of the 25 alternatives. The list of ranked alternative approaches is included in Appendix A of this RFP;
- Completed a preliminary matching exercise assessing which approaches or combinations of approaches might be appropriate at each of the sites on the critical erosion area list, and;
- Identified seven planning sub-regions within the larger southern Monterey Bay region

One of the primary goals for the SMBCEW, and a major impetus behind the formation of this group, is to identify and assess the range of options available for responding to erosion, and to pursue alternatives that go beyond the responses that have been used in the past, which are primarily seawalls and revetments. The intent of this RFP is to evaluate and develop recommendations on this range of potential alternatives for addressing coastal erosion in southern Monterey Bay (with the exception of beach nourishment, which was previously analyzed as part of the scope of the CRSMP) by building on products developed by MBNMS staff and the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion workgroup, and other existing sources. This includes analyzing the alternatives identified by the SMBCEW at a more detailed and technical level than previously carried out to date, and providing the workgroup with objective and scientifically defensible information necessary to assist them in developing specific recommendations for actions to be integrated into their final product – a regional shoreline preservation, restoration, and management plan.

The SMBCEW has developed a series of reports and background documents, based upon work accomplished, that the selected consultant can build off of for both components detailed in this RFP. These products are listed in the Appendix B of this RFP below.

## **B. Study Objective**

The objective of the *Technical Evaluation of Alternative Approaches to Addressing Coastal Erosion* is to analyze the costs and benefits of the complete range of options available for addressing coastal erosion in the SMB region identified by the SMBCEW, and make recommendations to the workgroup on the feasibility of various approaches. Throughout the process, to ensure consistency, information produced during the completion of the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan for the Southern Monterey Bay, will be integrated into the analysis of alternatives. The CRSMP will provide a scientific basis for information on erosion rates, coastal processes, and geomorphology.

### **C. Study Scope of Work**

Building on analyses and products developed by MBNMS staff, the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion workgroup and other existing sources, evaluate and develop detailed analyses and recommendations on a range of potential alternatives for addressing coastal erosion in southern Monterey Bay.

At the end of this document, a categorized list of considered alternatives can be found in Appendix A and a complete list of resources developed by the SMBCEW can be found in Appendix B.

#### ***Task 1: Conduct a Technical Evaluation of Alternatives***

Conduct a technical evaluation of a variety of alternatives considered by the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup, including a) erosion mitigation measures such as acquisitions, easements, and setbacks; b) regional approaches to slow beach erosion such as pressure equalizing modules, breakwaters, etc.; c) site-specific approaches for structures such as managed retreat or seawalls, and d) approaches that reduce factors exacerbating erosion, such as reduction of sand mining, controlling runoff, or adding fencing, plants, berms, etc.

*Subtask 1:* Conduct a preliminary and cursory evaluation of the full array of alternatives initially identified by the SMBCEW, to verify that those that were excluded for further consideration by the workgroup should, in fact, be dropped from further analysis for use in the SMB region (and conversely, to point out any alternatives identified for further evaluation by the workgroup that do not warrant further analysis). And if appropriate, make recommendations to the SMBCEW regarding the reconsideration of any options that they eliminated as not worth pursuing. Additionally, assess whether or not additional alternatives exist that were not identified by the SMBCEW. In the case that additional potentially feasible alternatives do exist, make recommendations to the workgroup for further analysis and consideration.

*Subtask 2:* Conduct a detailed analysis and evaluation of the remaining alternatives in Appendix A, but focus more attention on those that ranked most highly in the evaluation. Contractor will draw on existing sources of information wherever possible and modify these sources as needed to apply to the specific characteristics of this region. Criteria for evaluation will include effectiveness, economic costs, environmental impacts, recreation, safety and public access, aesthetics, and regulatory viability. Economic evaluations shall include estimated costs of project implementation (including costs for further feasibility assessment studies, environmental review, construction, monitoring, and ongoing maintenance) the value of beach retention and the costs of no action.

*Subtask 3:* Using background information compiled by the SMBCEW and building upon analyses completed for the CRSMP process, conduct further analysis of the impacts on sand transport and coastal erosion in the SMB region resulting from sand mining operations in Marina; review and verify the projected effects on sand supply from the CRSMP if this plant were to cease or scale back current operations on the beach.

*Subtask 4:* Assess and summarize the costs and benefits of the various alternatives based upon the above-mentioned considerations.

***Task 2: Recommendations and Matching of Alternatives to Critical Erosion Areas***

Based upon the evaluations from Task 1, make recommendations for appropriately matching alternatives and/or combinations of alternatives to the seven sub-regions and the array of Critical Erosion Areas identified by the workgroup.

*Subtask 1:* Develop recommendations for the most appropriate alternatives for each sub-region and/or critical erosion areas. Include broad recommendations for the most appropriate combinations of alternatives for each of the seven sub-regions and the region as a whole. Consider cumulative effects of combinations of alternatives.

*Subtask 2:* Produce cost estimates and regulatory feasibility assessment for recommended site-specific and regional projects using recommended alternatives.

*Subtask 3:* Develop recommendations for prioritizing and phasing of implementation among suggested alternatives and throughout sub-regions.

*Subtask 4:* Develop suggested methodologies for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of recommended alternatives.

*Subtask 5:* Identify EIR/EIS (CEQA/NEPA) requirements and develop a scope for initial studies that incorporates sediment management recommendations from the CRSMP.

***Task 3: Coordinate with SMBCEW, Present Study Findings and Produce GIS Products***

*Subtask 1:* Attend three or more meetings of the SMBCEW to ensure close coordination and responsiveness to their needs. SMBCEW will convene for a meeting at the onset of the project to provide guidance to the contractor in conducting the assessment, suggest information sources, etc. At this initial meeting with the SMBCEW, the selected contractor will provide an overview of their proposed methodology for completing the study. In addition, during the course of the project, the contractor will attend one or more SMBCEW meetings to provide progress reports. Finally, upon completion of a draft study report, present findings and recommendations to the SMBCEW, solicit comments, and incorporate suggested changes/edits.

*Subtask 2:* Following incorporation of SMBCEW comments, present study findings at a public meeting organized by MBNMS/AMBAG, and solicit comments on final draft. Work with MBNMS/AMBAG staff to incorporate resulting comments where appropriate.

*Subtask 3:* Produce and submit GIS layers showing specific locations, sub-regions and project type for recommended projects consistent with MBNMS and CSMW GIS databases.

### **III. SCHEDULE**

The schedule for this RFP process is as follows:

- A. Release of RFP: September 16, 2008
- B. Closing Date for RFP Responses: October 16, 2008
- C. Consultant Presentations and Interviews: October 20-24, 2008
- D. Contract Award Date: October 31, 2008

### **IV. CONTRACT DELIVERABLES**

Final products outlined in this RFP are due to the MBSF and MBNMS no later than May 30, 2009.

Products and presentations that are required as part of the contract include:

- A comprehensive report that describes the results of the technical evaluation and recommendations including information from all Tasks and Subtasks outlined in this RFP.
- GIS products described in *Task 4, subtask 3*.
- Two presentations to SMBCEW on proposed process, interim project progress updates and results of technical evaluation and recommendations. The schedule of those meetings to be mutually agreed upon.
- A public presentation of the draft plan, to be scheduled at a mutually agreeable time and location.

All reports and deliverables must be submitted electronically to MBSF in Microsoft Word and Adobe PDF formats (or a compatible alternative). One (1) hard copy version of each report or deliverable should be sent to Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation, Coastal Erosion Project, 299 Foam Street, Suite D, Monterey, CA 93940

### **V. MEETINGS**

In addition to the aforementioned SMBCEW and public meetings, the consultant(s) will be requested to participate in additional joint meetings with representatives from the MBNMS, AMBAG, and the State Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup to share feedback and review the project status. These meetings will be held in Monterey at the MBNMS headquarters, or at the AMBAG offices in Marina. The consultant should delineate the per-meeting cost of attending these additional meetings as part of their proposal.

### **VI. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS**

Proposal content and completeness are important. Clarity and conciseness are essential and will be considered in assessing the proposal's merits.

One (1) electronic, one (1) reproducible and five (5) stapled/bound copies of the proposal must be received by MBSF by no later than October 15, 2008, 4:00 P.M. Pacific Standard Time. Proposals received after that date and time will not be considered.

Address information:  
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation  
Ref.: Coastal Erosion Proposal  
299 Foam Street, Suite D  
Monterey, CA 93940

Email: [jacqueline@mbnmsf.org](mailto:jacqueline@mbnmsf.org)

In order to simplify the review process and to maximize the degree of comparative analysis, the proposal should be organized in the following manner.

A. *Transmittal Letter*

The transmittal letter must be signed by an official authorized to bind the consultant contractually and will contain a statement to the effect that the proposal is a firm offer for 90 days. The letter accompanying the proposal will also provide the following: name, title, address, telephone number, and e-mail address of individuals with the authority to negotiate and contractually bind the company. The transmittal letter should be addressed to Dennis J. Long, Executive Director, Monterey Bay Sanctuary Foundation.

B. *Table of Contents*

The Table of Contents should include identification of the material by page number.

C. *Overview*

This section should clearly convey the consultant's understanding of the nature of the work and the general approach to be taken to its performance. This section should include, but not be limited to, a discussion of the purpose of the project, the organization of the project effort, and a summary of the proposed approach.

D. *Detailed Work Plan*

This section should include:

Task Description

Include a full description of each step to be followed in carrying out the project. The work description should be presented in sufficient detail (tasks, subtasks, etc.) to show a clear understanding of the work and the proposed approach.

Deliverables

A description of the format, content and level of detail is expected for each deliverable.

Schedule

A schedule showing the expected sequence of tasks, subtasks, etc. should accompany the work description. Important milestones, such as due dates for deliverable products, should be identified on the schedule.



E. *Project Management Approach*

This section should describe the consultant's project management approach. If the proposal is a team effort, the distribution of work among the team members should be indicated. Describe the organization of the management, the structure of the work assignments and any specific features of the management approach that require special explanation. The prospective consultant will designate by name the project manager to be employed who will oversee the project. No substitutions of the identified project manager will be allowed without prior approval of the MBSF and MBNMS.

Include the names and qualifications of all professional personnel to be employed, a resume for each professional (include in an appendix), a statement indicating how many hours each professional will be assigned to the contract, and what tasks each professional will perform. Staffing assignments should be specific enough to demonstrate understanding of skills required, commitment of proper resources and staff availability. The Consultant will not substitute members of the project team without prior approval of the MBSF and MBNMS.

F. *Summary of Related Previous Projects and References*

Provide a short description of previous projects that significantly relate to your qualifications for this project. Provide names, addresses, and telephone numbers for at least three clients for whom the individual consultant/firm performed services similar to those described in this request for proposal.

G. *Budget and Cost Breakdown*

The prospective consultant will provide a detailed cost breakdown for the work to be performed during the project. This will include all tasks required to complete the project including final reports, meetings, and presentations.

The cost breakdown should itemize all items that will be charged (including travel charges that will be involved in the study) and included in the bid amount. Costs should be segregated to show actual salary costs including hours, rates, classifications, and administrative overhead and fringe benefit expenses, as well as Other Direct Costs.

This section should provide a full description of the expected expenditures of funds for the work described in this request for proposal. The cost breakdown should include but is not limited to the following:

**Task Budget:** A breakdown of expenses and hours by task and key personnel to ensure a full understanding of the resources committed to the project.

**Cost Breakdown:** A breakdown of costs (direct labor, overhead, other direct costs, etc.), including billing rates for key personnel.

Costs for any additional anticipated work, such as additional meetings beyond those identified in the Scope of Work, should also be identified in this section.

File copies of all products developed by the consultant(s) for this project shall be delivered electronically to MBNMS staff on CD-ROM or DVD. All data, maps and other materials prepared or collected under this contract shall become the property of MBNMS.

## **VII. SELECTION CRITERIA**

A selection team consisting of representatives from MBNMS, MBSF, AMBAG, City of Monterey, State of CA Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW) and SMBCEW will evaluate proposals, using the following criteria.

### **1. Past Performance/Experience: 20 points**

The firm/team's past experience with similar projects, including:

- The nature and quality of the past completed work;
- Demonstrated ability to meet deadlines, and stay within budget;
- Proven track record working on similar large-scale regional collaborative projects involving coastal erosion or related issues

### **2. Technical/Expertise: 25 points**

The ability of the firm/team to evaluate each erosion response alternative based upon: effectiveness, economic costs, environmental impacts, recreation, safety and public access, aesthetics, and regulatory considerations. This criteria is based upon education and experience of key personnel including:

- Knowledge of coastal processes, sand transport dynamics, geomorphology, and critical erosion areas in Southern Monterey Bay region
- Coastal engineering expertise and capability to determine projected effectiveness of each alternative and estimated economic costs. Familiarity with the wide range of coastal erosion mitigation techniques and structures listed in *Appendix A* of this RFP, especially those that ranked most highly in initial SMBCEW evaluations.
- Biological/ecological knowledge including familiarity with organisms and habitats in the SMB region and ability to thoroughly examine the potential impacts of identified alternatives to habitats and organisms
- Familiarity with local conditions in the Southern Monterey Bay region including: local, state and federal policies and regulations, ocean and coastal resource management, ongoing research and available data for this stretch of coast, threatened infrastructure and buildings, past and ongoing efforts to address coastal erosion issues in the region, etc.

### **3. Proposed Approach/methodology: 25 points**

This score is based on an evaluation of the proposed methodologies and approaches for evaluating and prioritizing alternatives and developing a recommended regional approach or combinations of alternatives for restoring and preserving the southern

Monterey Bay shoreline. Also considered are the suggested methodologies for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the recommended alternatives.

**4. Ability to meet project schedule: 10 points**

This involves an assessment of the firm/team's ability to meet an ambitious proposed project schedule, which includes delivery of a final product 6-months from the start date.

**5. Clarity and conciseness of proposal: 10 points**

Proposals will be evaluated for clarity and conciseness in conveying the required information.

**6. Contract Price: 10 points**

This criterion takes into consideration the proposed price of the contract, relative to other proposals received.

**Overview of Selection Criteria and Weighting:**

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Past Performance/Experience         | 0 – 20 points                           |
| Technical                           | 0 – 25 points                           |
| Proposed approach                   | 0—25 points                             |
| Ability to meet schedule            | 0—10 points                             |
| Clarity and conciseness of proposal | 0—10 points                             |
| <u>Contract Price</u>               | <u>0—10 points</u>                      |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                        | <b>100 points (best possible score)</b> |

**VII. SELECTION PROCESS**

All proposals submitted in response to this request will be screened by a panel of AMBAG, MBSF, MBNMS, and SMBCEW representatives. The screening panel will determine which consultants will be invited to make formal presentations and be interviewed, if any. The selection team will make its recommendation to the MBSF, who will then negotiate a contract directly with the selected contractor.

**VIII. BUDGET**

The budget for this project is not to exceed \$85,000.

**IX. CONTRACT PAYMENT TERMS**

A one-page Monthly Status Report shall be submitted by the consultant to the MBSF and MBNMS by the 4th of each month for activities in the previous month for each component of the project. The Monthly Status Report will include a summary of work accomplished during the previous month, a discussion of progress toward the objective of the work, an account of any significant problems, delays, or other difficulties encountered, and an approximation of the percent of the project completed to date.

**X. QUESTIONS ON THE RFP**

All questions related to the RFP should be directed to:

Brad Damitz  
Environmental Policy Specialist  
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary  
Brad.damitz@noaa.gov  
415/259-5766 (voice)  
415/532-2838 (fax)

**XI. Submission of Proposal/Period of Acceptance**

All proposals will remain firm for a period of ninety (90) days following the final date for submission. All proposals will become the sole property of MBSF and a part of its official records without obligation.

This RFP is not to be construed as a contract or commitment on the part of MBSF or additional responsible entities. MBSF reserves the right to reject all proposals, to seek additional information from each proposer, to hire a consultant without conducting screening interviews, or to issue another RFP, if deemed appropriate.

## Appendix A

### **Categorized Coastal Erosion Response Alternatives for Southern Monterey Bay**

As identified by the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup

#### Approaches to be used when addressing future developments:

(Preliminary score\* in parentheses, higher numbers represent higher scoring alternatives)

##### *Prevent or discourage development in areas threatened by erosion*

- Transfer of development credit (20)
- Conservation Easements (19)
- Fee Simple Acquisition (18)
- Present use tax (18)

##### *Avoid threats from erosion permanently or for many years*

- Rolling easements (19)
- Structural or Habitat Adaptation (17)
- Setbacks for Bluff top Development (17)
- Setbacks + Elevation for Beach Level Development (16)

#### Regional approaches to be used for larger area-wide responses to slow beach erosion:

(Preliminary score in parentheses)

- Beach Nourishment
  - Nearshore Placement (15)
  - Beach Placement (14)
  - Dredge Sand from Deep or Offshore Deposits (14)
- Dune Nourishment (adding both sand and vegetation) (14)
- Pressure Equalizing Modules (14)
- Beach Dewatering (12)
- Submerged Breakwaters/Artificial Reefs (12)
- Inter-littoral Cell Transfers (11)
- Perched Beaches (11)
- Groins (11)
- Emergent Breakwaters (10)

#### Site-specific approaches to be used for existing structures that are threatened by erosion:

(Preliminary score in parentheses)

##### *Move or remove structures away from erosive forces*

- Managed retreat (18)

##### *Move erosive forces away from the threatened structure*

- Seawalls (8)

- Revetments (8)

Approaches that reduce factors that exacerbate erosion

(Preliminary score in parentheses)

*Site-specific (often used in combination with other approaches)*

- Native Plants (12)
- Sand Fencing/Dune Guard Fencing (11)
- Controlling Surface Run-off (11)
- Controlling Groundwater (11)
- Berms/Beach Scraping (9 or 10)

*Regional*

- Sand Mining cessation (19)

*\*The scores for each alternative reflect the overall evaluation, although specific approaches do not necessarily apply to all situations. In many cases combinations of approaches will be required based on the specifics of each site and sub-region.*

## **Appendix B**

### **Existing Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup products for contractor to draw from:**

- MBNMS, 2005. Technical Report on Coastal Erosion and Armoring in Southern Monterey Bay
- SMBCEW, 2005 Goals and objectives summary
- SMBCEW, 2005 Southern Monterey Bay Critical Erosion Site Prioritization
- SMBCEW, 2006. Critical Coastal Erosion Areas in Southern Monterey Bay Region.
- SMBCEW, 2006 Planning Sub-regions in Southern Monterey Bay Region
- SMBCEW, 2006. Summary of Alternative Erosion Responses
- SMBCEW, 2006 Assessment of Erosion Response Alternatives—Summary Prioritization Matrix
- SMBCEW, 2006 Assessment of Erosion Response Alternatives—Prioritization by Subregion
- SMBCEW, 2007 Evaluation of Funding Options for Shoreline Preservation Projects
- SMBCEW, 2007 Regulatory And Policy Considerations for Shoreline Preservation Projects